



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/621,045

07/21/2000

Masayuki Takayama

848075/0016

4035

29619 7590 11/24/2008

SCHULTE ROTH & ZABEL LLP

ATTN: JOEL E. LUTZKER

919 THIRD AVENUE

NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

RAMPURIA, SHARAD K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/24/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

***Response to Remarks***

Applicant's arguments filed on 10/27/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

***Relating to Claim 1:***

In view of the fact, that **BARTLING** teaches, "The ancillary chip 110 receives ...the output VCCO1 powers the nonvolatile microcontroller 120, and the output VCCO2 powers the liquid-crystal display driver 140." (Bartling, Col.8; 48-52). Thus, it is evidently, the explanations above is directed to telecommunications systems and methods for in a low-power microprocessor system where a communications link interfaced to the microprocessor via using buses (as well-known in the art), therefore *the above communication lines feeding signals via data-buses* as shown in the cited section, that positively, anticipated by **BARTLING**. Hence, it is believed that **BARTLING** still teaches the claimed limitations.

The above arguments also recites for the other independent claims, consequently the response is the same explanation as set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Because the remaining claims depend directly/indirectly, from one of the independent claims discussed above, as a result the response is the same justification as set forth above.

With the intention of that explanation, it is believed and as enlighten above, the refutation are sustained.

/Sharad Rampuria/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2617